

REMARKS

Claims 41 and 47 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18, 20-30, 32-35 and 41-47 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 13, 18, 30, 41, 46 and 47 are the independent claims. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants note that claim 47 has been amended to correct the minor informality noted by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 47 fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and therefore request that the rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 41 has been amended to correct the minor informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 41, as amended, fully complies with requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and request that the rejection of independent claim 41 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 42 and 43, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 41 and therefore also comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 42 and 43 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 3-4, 16, 13, 18, 21, 30 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Richards (U.S. Patent 6,385,723).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 18 and 46, it is noted that claims 1, 18 and 46 recite a copy protection method and a method of encrypting a text comprising, amongst other novel features, **encrypting a first region of a text containing a second encryption key using a first encryption key; encrypting a second region of the text using the second encryption key**; transmitting a cipher text comprising the encrypted first and second regions; transmitting the first encryption key, region segmentation information for segmenting the text into the first region and the second region, and information related to the second encryption key; decrypting the first region of the transmitted cipher text using the transmitted first encryption key and the transmitted region segmentation information; extracting the second encryption key from the decrypted first region using the transmitted information related to the second encryption key; and decrypting the second region of the transmitted cipher text using the extracted second encryption key.

The Office Action relies on Richards for a teaching of **encrypting a first region of a text containing a second encryption key using a first encryption key**, and cites FIG. 5, items 503, 507 and FIG. 6, item 615 for such teaching. The Office Action further indicates that the first encryption key is public key, mkd_pk and that the second encryption key is key data 615.

A detailed review of Richards indicates that the alleged second encryption key (key data 615) noted in the Office Action is not an encryption key itself but rather is a key data field (column 8, lines 57-63). This field 615 indicates the key data for the particular encrypted portion and the key data is used with the algorithm identity and the location of the encoded portion to decode the encrypted portion (column 9, lines 16-19). In other words, field 615 is a field in which key data and other data are stored and not an encryption key itself, as recited in the independent claims. Therefore, key field 615 does not meet the requirements of a second encryption key.

The Office Action also indicates that Richards teaches **encrypting a second region of the text using the second encryption key**, and cites column 6, lines 22-26 and column 7, lines 16-44 for such teaching. The Office Action also notes that the AU contains encrypted regions

that are encrypted using a symmetric key contained in the KTU.

However, as noted above, the alleged second encryption key, key data 615, is not an encryption key but rather a data field in which key data is stored. Therefore, it is not possible for the key data 615, which only contains data, to encode a second region of text since key data 615 is not an encryption key. As for the AU containing encrypted regions that are encrypted using the symmetric key contained in the KTU, Applicants note that there is no relationship between this feature and encrypting a second region of text using the second encryption key, as recited in the claims. The fact that the AU can be encrypted using a symmetric key only indicates that the encryption and decryption are done using a same key (column 4, lines 61-67 and column 5, lines 1-4). Therefore, Richards fails to teach or suggest this novel feature of the independent claims.

The Office Action also indicates that Richards teaches decrypting the first region of the transmitted cipher text (KTU ciphertext 503) using the transmitted first encryption key (public key, mkd_pk) and the transmitted region segmentation information and relies on FIG. 10, item 1003 for such teaching.

However, a detailed review of Richards indicates that the KTU ciphertext 503 is decrypted using the IC card's secret key mkd_sk (column 10, lines 66-67) and not the public key, mkd_pk, which the Office Action relies upon for a teaching of the first encryption key. Accordingly, Richards fails to teach or suggest this novel feature of the independent claims.

Furthermore, Richards also fails to teach or suggest transmitting a cipher text comprising the encrypted first and second regions; transmitting the first encryption key, region segmentation information for segmenting the text into the first region and the second region, and information related to the second encryption key; decrypting the first region of the transmitted cipher text using the transmitted first encryption key and the transmitted region segmentation information; extracting the second encryption key from the decrypted first region using the transmitted information related to the second encryption key; and decrypting the second region of the transmitted cipher text using the extracted second encryption key.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 1, 18 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn because Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in the independent claims.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 3, 4

and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 4 and 16 also distinguish over the prior art.

Applicants also respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn at least because of its dependence from claim 18 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claim includes additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 also distinguishes over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 13 and 30, it is noted that claims 13 and 30 recite a copy protection method and a method of decrypting an encrypted text comprising, amongst other novel features, decrypting the first region of the cipher text using the transmitted first encryption key and the transmitted region segmentation information; extracting the second encryption key from the decrypted first region using the transmitted second encryption key information; and decrypting the second region of the text using the extracted second encryption key.

As noted above, the Office Action indicates that Richards teaches decrypting the first region of the transmitted cipher text (KTU ciphertext 503) using the transmitted first encryption key (public key, mkd_pk) and relies on FIG. 10, item 1003 for such teaching.

However, as also noted above, a detailed review of Richards indicates that the KTU ciphertext 503 is decrypted using the IC card's secret key mkd_sk (column 10, lines 66-67) and not the public key, mkd_pk which the Office Action relies upon for a teaching of the first encryption key. Accordingly, Richards fails to teach or suggest this novel feature of the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims 13 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Richards fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 13 and 30.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 5, 7-11, 17, 15, 20, 22, 24-28, 32, 35 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is noted that claims 5, 7-11 and 17 depend from independent claim 1, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 5, 7-11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 7-11 and 17 also distinguish over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of claim 15, it is noted that claim 15 depends from independent claim 13, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of its dependence from claim 13 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claim includes additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 also distinguishes over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of claims 20, 22 and 24-28, it is noted that claims 20, 22 and 24-28 depend from independent claim 18, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claim 18.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 20, 22 and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 18 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20, 22 and 24-28 also distinguish over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of claims 32 and 35, it is noted that claims 32 and 35 depend from independent claim 30, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claim 30.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 30 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 32 and 35 also distinguish over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 47, it is noted that claim 47 recites a copy protection method comprising, amongst other novel features, encrypting a first region of a text using a first encryption key; encrypting a second region of the text using a second encryption key; transmitting the encrypted first and second regions, the first encryption key, region segmentation information for segmenting the first and second regions, and information related to the second encryption key; decrypting the first region using the transmitted first encryption key and the transmitted region segmentation information; and decrypting the second region after extracting the second encryption key located in the first encrypted region.

As noted above, the Office Action indicates that Richards teaches decrypting the first region of the transmitted cipher text (KTU ciphertext 503) using the transmitted first encryption key (public key, mkd_pk) and relies on FIG. 10, item 1003 for such teaching.

However, as also noted above, Richards indicates that the KTU ciphertext 503 is decrypted using the IC card's secret key mkd_sk (column 10, lines 66-67) and not the public key, mkd_pk which the Office Action relies upon for a teaching of the first encryption key. Accordingly, Richards fails to teach or suggest this novel feature of the independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Richards fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 47.

Claims 6, 14, 23 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards in view of McGough (U.S. Patent 6,445,797).

Regarding the rejection of claims 6, 14, 23 and 34 it is noted that claims 6, 14, 23 and 34 depend from independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 30, respectively, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 30.

McGough teaches a method and system for performing secure electronic digital

streaming. McGough however fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in the independent claims and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Richards.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 6, 14, 23 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claims 1, 13, 18 and 30 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6, 13, 18 and 30 also distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards (U.S. Patent 6,385,723) in view of applicant's admittance of prior art.

Regarding the rejection of claims 29 and 33 it is noted that claims 29 and 33 depend from independent claims 18 and 30, respectively, and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claims 18 and 30.

Applicant's Admittance of Prior art also fails to teach or suggest the novel features recited in independent claims 18 and 30 and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Richards.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 29 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claims 18 and 30 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 29 and 33 also distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102/103:

Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) as anticipated by applicant's admittance of prior art or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over applicant's admittance or prior art in view of Richards.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 41 has been amended and now depends from independent claim 1.

As noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 1. Applicant's admittance of prior art also fails to teach or suggest the novel features of

claim 1 and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Richards.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 41 and 42 also distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as obvious over applicant's admittance or prior art in view of Richards.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claims 43-45 depend from claim 41 which now depends from claim 1 and as noted above, Richards fails to teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 1. Applicant's admittance of prior art also fails to teach or suggest the novel features of claim 1 and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Richards.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 43-45 also distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 11/22/06

By: Douglas Rodriguez
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510